

and send the authorization back to the President for his signature. The bill before us, H.R. 5630, is identical to the version of H.R. 4392 that passed the House and the Senate on October 12 of this year with one major exception. The language, formerly section 304, prohibiting the unauthorized disclosure of classified information has been removed in its entirety.

All the other provisions remain the same. I would stress that it is my intent that the provisions in H.R. 5630 be implemented in accordance with the recommendations contained in the conference report that accompanied H.R. 4392.

Passage of H.R. 5630 by the House today would send the revised version of the fiscal year 2001 Intelligence Authorization Act to the Senate for what I hope will be a speedy consideration and passage in that body.

I want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. DIXON), the ranking member, along with the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS), the vice chairman, our appropriator, for cosponsoring H.R. 5630. I believe that all we want is to get this important bill back to the President for his signature.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) for a colloquy with the chairman of the committee.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, one provision in this bill purports to expand the Nazi War Criminal Records Disclosure Act to include war crimes committed by the Imperial Japanese during World War II. The problem with this, as I see it, is that under title VIII of the bill, the CIA is given the power to exempt automatically all its operational files on Japanese war criminals from declassification. So it seems that the bill, or the conference report, sets up a double standard. CIA operational files relating to Nazi war crimes must be disclosed, but CIA operational files relating to Japanese war crimes may be absolutely shielded from disclosure.

In addition to that, some people read title VIII as shielding Nazi war crimes operational files from disclosure as well since title VIII explicitly covers allies of Imperial Japan, and Nazi Germany obviously was an ally of Imperial Japan.

Now, I know that the intent of the sponsors of the bill and the intent of the bill is to expand the Nazi War Crimes Disclosure Act to cover Japanese war crimes. I am somewhat concerned that inadvertently it may be shielding operational files of the CIA with respect to Japanese war crimes and maybe even going so far as to shield that with respect to Nazi war crimes. I would ask the gentleman what he can tell me to assure me that obviously it is not the intent or that this is not the effect.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from California will yield, I am

very happy to confirm exactly that point. That is not the intent, to create a double standard. The intent was to create a uniformity of protection for classified information. We think we got it right. If it turns out that is wrong and there is something demonstrable, obviously we are prepared to go back and reaffirm our intent and make sure that that intent happens. There is no double standard. I think we discussed this not only in committee but in the discussion on the floor when we passed the bill. I think my comments are consistent, and, I hope, helpful.

Mr. NADLER. I thank the gentleman. I trust he will look into this because I am reflecting the concerns of one of the authors of the original Nazi War Crimes Disclosure Act, a former Member of this body, Liz Holtzman, who sent me a memo on this and called my office about it. It does seem to give a shield to operational details of the CIA with respect to Japanese war crimes. I can think of no reason. I cannot imagine that an American spy against Japan in World War II needs protection from disclosure at this point. If that were disclosed, he would probably be a hero. The Imperial Japanese are not looking for him at this point. So I hope that this will be looked into in conference and corrected if need be.

Mr. GOSS. If the gentleman will continue to yield, I want to assure the gentleman that I believe this is a non-problem. If it turns out I am wrong, and I do not think I will be, I will be certainly a part of the solution.

Mr. NADLER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I believe it is important to underscore the point the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) has made. It is certainly my expectation that the recommendations contained in the Statement of Managers which accompanied the conference report on H.R. 4392 will be accorded the same weight by the executive branch interpreting H.R. 5630 as would have been the case had H.R. 4392 been enacted. The Statement of Managers reflects the intent of Congress on how intelligence programs and activities authorized for fiscal year 2001 are to be conducted.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 5630, the bill just considered and passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 5630, INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2001

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of the bill, H.R. 5630, the Clerk be authorized to make such technical and conforming changes as may be necessary.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair announces that he will postpone further proceedings today on the motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Any record vote on the postponed question will be taken tomorrow.

DIRECTING TREATMENT OF BOUNDARIES OF LAWRENCE COUNTY AIRPORT, COURTLAND, ALABAMA

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5111) to direct the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to treat certain property boundaries as the boundaries of the Lawrence County Airport Courtland, Alabama, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 5111

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. LAWRENCE COUNTY AIRPORT, COURTLAND, ALABAMA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—With respect to the airport located at Courtland, Lawrence County, Alabama (formerly known as the George C. Wallace Airport), the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall treat as the boundaries of the airport property those boundaries shown on the airport layout drawing produced by Garver, Inc., dated March 8, 1999, and approved by the Jackson Airport District Office of the Administration.

(b) TREATMENT OF NONAIRPORT PROPERTY.—The Administrator may not treat as airport property any real property not designated as airport property in the drawing referred to in subsection (a) regardless of whether such real property was designated as airport property at any time prior to March 8, 1999.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr.

McGOVERN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN).

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I will be very brief. This bill would declare that the boundaries of the airport in Lawrence County, Alabama, are the boundaries set forth in the airport layout plan of March 8, 1999.

The effect of this bill is to remove Federal use restrictions on about 200 acres and let Lawrence County use the land to meet local needs.

Originally, this property was part of a military air base. It was transferred to Alabama at the end of World War II. Alabama's aeronautics commission ran the airport until 1980 when it sold it to TVA. The TVA, the Tennessee Valley Authority, sold it to Lawrence County in 1985.

Lawrence County applied for and received an Airport Improvement Program grant from the FAA in the late 1980s. At that time it submitted an airport layout plan showing the boundaries of the airport as containing about 600 acres.

On March 8, 1999, the airport revised its airport layout plan. The revised plan showed the airport as containing only 414 acres.

The FAA believes the 1980s airport layout plan, with 600 acres, controls. That is when the airport received its AIP grant from the FAA and promised to use its land only for airport purposes.

Generally, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure vigorously defends the need to preserve airport land. Last year, the Subcommittee on Aviation held a hearing on this subject. And AIR 21 contains several procedural protections to help preserve our Nation's airports.

However, in this case the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ADERHOLT) has made a strong case for the need for this change. He has shown that the airport really only requires 414 acres to handle the aviation needs of the community. Also, it is my understanding that the FAA now supports reducing the size of the airport to 414 acres, but it does not feel it can do so without this legislation. Moreover, the FAA had previously given the airport a release from the deed restrictions on this land.

Therefore, for all these reasons, I support this bill and urge its passage.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bill sponsored by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ADERHOLT), which directs the FAA to use a revised March 8, 1999, airport layout plan to determine the boundaries of the Lawrence County Airport, located in Courtland, Alabama. However, this bill is based on a

unique set of circumstances and should not be viewed as a precedent for diverting revenues from the sale of airport property.

In the late 1980s, a master plan for Lawrence County Airport prepared by the Industrial Development Board of Lawrence County included more airport property than was needed for the current and foreseeable requirements of the airport. Although the excess property was included in exhibits to Federal grant agreements as airport property, it was not material to any FAA decision to award Airport Improvement Program funds for the development of the airport. In addition, the excess property was not included in the airport layout plan recently approved by the FAA.

Mr. Speaker, this bill would confirm the boundaries of the airport shown on the airport layout plan approved by the FAA on March 8, 1999, and release the sponsor from the obligation to put the proceeds of sale for property not within the agreed boundaries of the airport into the airport account.

Based on these unique circumstances, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ADERHOLT), the sponsor of this legislation.

□ 1900

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman SHUSTER); the ranking member, the gentleman from Minnesota Mr. OBERSTAR; and the gentleman from Tennessee (Chairman DUNCAN) for working with me to bring this bill for making a technical correction to the boundaries of the Lawrence County Airport to the floor this evening.

Back in 1999, as it has been stated before, the FAA approved a revised layout plan for the Lawrence County Airport in Courtland, Alabama, which states that the ownership and the management of the airport consists of approximately 414 acres. This plan has been approved by the FAA and the local industrial development board in Lawrence County, Alabama.

The FAA subsequently uncovered a map submitted in 1989 with a grant application for runway improvements showing the airport as consisting of approximately 600 acres. The additional acreage was incorporated into the grant application to accommodate an extension of the existing 5,000 foot runway to 7,000 feet each over a period of 20 years. There is no need for aircraft which require a 7,000 foot in the area, and this plan has not proceeded.

Due to the discrepancy between the old grant application and the FAA's re-

vised layout plan, Lawrence County is not able to use the property. H.R. 5111 makes technical and conforming changes that clarify that the 414 acre layout plan is in effect.

Again, I would like to thank the chairman and the other members of the committee for their support, and ask my colleagues to support H.R. 5111.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to object to the bill sponsored by the Gentleman from Alabama, Mr. ADERHOLT, which directs the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) to use a revised March 8, 1999 airport layout plan to determine the boundaries of the Lawrence County Airport, located in Courtland, Alabama. However, I want to make it clear that this bill should not be viewed as a precedent for diverting revenues from the sale of airport property.

Since 1982, and in subsequent reauthorization legislation, Congress has placed very strict conditions on the use of airport revenues to ensure that the revenues would be used primarily for airport purposes. In 1999, FAA issued its final revenue use policy, which states that any revenue from the sale of airport real property not acquired with Federal assistance will be considered airport revenue. Accordingly, the policy requires that the airport operator deposit the fair market value from the sale of the property into the airport account.

In the situation at hand, a master plan for Lawrence County Airport prepared by the Industrial Development Board of Lawrence County in the late 1980's showed more airport property that was needed for the current and foreseeable requirements of the airport. The excess property was included in exhibits to Federal grant agreements as airport property, but was not material to any FAA decision to award Airport Improvement Program funds for the development of the airport. However, the FAA recently approved an airport layout plan allowing for limited commercial development on approximately 200 acres of land surrounding the Lawrence County Airport.

This bill would confirm the boundaries of the airport shown on the airport layout plan approved by the FAA on March 12, 1999, and release the sponsor from the obligation to put the proceeds of sale for property not within the agreed boundaries of the airport into the airport account.

This narrow legislation is based on a unique set of circumstances and should not be considered a precedent for a change in the clear policy on use of airport revenues. I am strongly supportive of requiring that proceeds from the sale or rental of airport property must be used for the capital and operating costs of the airport.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5111.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.